

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DPW

Fax: 571-273-8300
Commissioner for Patents,
Alexandria, Virginia
Paris, 20th April 2006

Appl.10/505,353 (PCT/EP02/02302) Art.Unit 1648, Conf.N°2545
Dr.Y.Zagyansky, Entraide, 22 rue Ste Marthe 75010 Paris

Dear Sir, §1. The FORMAL. Permanent problems with post continue. a). Again and again, I received your letter, of 01/27/2006, today 20th April b). French Post, even at level of new responsible Minister, continue surely to look as Criminal Organization (due to Documentation sent due to previous Minister Francis Mer personally, fired justly by political reasons according to Press). c). Since his obligatory 1st answer, USPTO did not answer for special §5 of even Covering Letter (08/11/2004) (even after insistent reminders): about logically obligatory sending of final registered letter by USPTO (if there is no Applicant's answer). Because in 37CFR §1.8 (§512 MPEP) "Certificat of mailing or transmission", there is no mention about even Declaration for nonreceiving of USPTO letters. This strange fluid "weapon" costed me millions in the past.. So USPTO intentional silence since 1.5 years, even during Application procedure, is logically special open potentialization of new crime?

§2. PROVEN INTENTIONAL FALSIFICATIONS BY INTERNATIONAL SEARCH AUTHORITY (EPO) WITH ALMOST UNMADE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH. I sent very detailed letter (22 Oct.05) (17 dense pages and Suppl.) to EPO (you can see it completely on EPO "Register"- www.epo.org, but I am sending it also by attachment to e-mail with copy of this signed text [PCT Rules: 89ter1, 92.1(a), 94a]. They should make finally complete International Search. Such PCT Search, made according to the same PCT Guidelines as for USPTO, must be certainly obligatory "substantively" followed by USPTO at National phase. Moreover, USPTO and EPO signed "Memorandum of understanding" (MOU) about "harmonization or standardization of Search strategies tools and substantive Patent Law". Moreover, in my such so fundamental answer, there are the essential of answer for your even unconcrete letter too. So because of above, I asked USPTO for "Suspension of action by the Office" for 6 months [§1.103(a) MPEP] (Fax: N° FA1-03-55953- 11/28/2005 "Cyber Cube" and e-mails). But again, without any explanation, you did not answer for above and did not take attention for this in your subsequent letter. (I asked such Suspension in analogous conditions for my other US-PCT Application too- so 2 your letters disappeared again?).

§3. TO WAIT OBLIGATORY INTERNATIONAL SEARCH (EPO-ISA) (after surely proven falsifications- see attachment). So, because of above, I ask you "Suspension of action by the Office" [§1.103(a) MPEP] for 6 months. But in the case of unknown problems, I ask you the extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) for 6 months (logically it must be since proven time of receiving of your letter- see copy of envelope below: unlegally The Post systematically does not make any stamp).

§4. I state that corrections (evident slips) at entering at National phase (11 Aug.2004) do not contain new matter. Sincerely Dr.Y.Zagyansky

Yul Nagi *Yul Zagyansky* *Yul...* *Yul...*

Post Letter with receipt of Fax 21 APR 06 (N°FA1-06-03416) 2) COPY Fax of 28 NOV 05 (N°FA1-03-55953) and 3) TEXT OF LETTER OF 22 OCT 05 TO EPO WITH SUPPL. (it will be sent by e-mail as attachment too, today 21/04/2006) with its 1st page with ORIGINAL STAMP OF EPO (from Internet). ALL pages are resigned Yul Zagyansky 21 Apr. 2006

Organization U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Bldg./Room 1648
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
IF UNDELIVERABLE RETURN IN TEN DAYS
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

18 APR. 2006

Stamp of "Entrance"

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR
10/505,353	08/19/2004	Yuly Zagyansky
7590	01/27/2006	

European Patent Office
Dr. Y. Zagayansky, Estrada, 22 rue Sainte Marthe 75010 Paris France
(e-mail Copies to President of EPO Prof. Alain Pompidou (mailto:alain.pompidou@epo.org), Vice-
Presidents: Mrs. T. Hammer, P. Kyriakides, P. Masserli, C. Edjell, M. Desantes; President and Vice-President
of EPO Administrative Council Roland Grossenbacher (mailto:roland.grossenbacher@epo.org),
council_secretary@epo.org, with all its (Admin Council) National Members as: AT@epo.org...; Principal (of
course) Director of International Affairs and Patent Law Wim Van Der Eljck: wvd@epo.org, Head of
Legal and International Affairs Felix Ador (mailto:felix.ador@epo.org), International Legal Affairs@epo.org, Directors
European and International Affairs Johan Amand and A. Purucker-Kandell: jamand@epo.org,
apurucker@epo.org, Patent Academy academy@epo.org and also to Director of World International
Patent Organization K. Idri (mailto:wipo.int) and to General Colloquium of European Judges for
Concerning Information: Imminent Accusation in International Crime against Humanity and International
Brigandage for Millions by Powerful Ruling BIG ORGANIZATION in EPO). Paris, 22th October 2005.

INTRODUCTORY GENERAL PART.

Sir, 1. **PROTEST.** This letter is **PROTEST** against patently destructed International Search ("Search") without any answer for EVIDENT arguments that EPO cannot answer simply ignoring them as EPO can do systematically in silence being above law, like due to special Power of Big Organization. After such primitive intentional ignoring, the illegal jumping, at once, to Examination represents the completely illegal procedure with its product: so called "Examination", existence of which is under protest too.

2. **CONTENT.** This letter (as the signed postal original that must be at EPO Registrar for all Judges too) contains 24 pages (all pages are signed): (1) "RESUME", (2) "Essential Questions of Resume" (3) "PURPOSE", (4) "Main Text of Letter" with "Résumé of Questions and demanded confirmations". With its Supplements: a) Statement about below (b) corrections with photocopies of coordinates of cited Refs from my retried PCT/FR97/01708 and PCT/FR98/02334 (100% proofs of obvious errors de facto). There is no relation between these slips and EPO's remarks. b) Copy (from EPO REGISTER with its traces) of my TOO IMPORTANT (for End of AIDS) Fax (8 pages) that appeared for couple of days in Registrar and disappeared confirming intentional crime against Humanity by Ruling ORGANIZATION (pp. 19-24 of this letter). c) Pages with corrected unanswered (by EPO) slips in 3 copies (non numbered in this letter): p.82 (with only missed "coordinates" of cited Refs of Part VI (N°s 10), p.87 (with only missed "coordinates" of cited Refs of Chapters XI and Annex IIIA), p.87 (Claim 9 is also against cancer).

3. **PURPOSE OF SHORT "RESUME" with "ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS OF RESUME."** Short "Résumé" with "Essential Questions of Résumé" represents **ALREADY** sure, decisive proofs for S1 (above), moreover accessible for all GENERAL Judges: too simple FORMAL and patently intentional. Please, to answer finally: **concretely point after point (for Court dossier) too.**

4. **"MAIN TEXT OF LETTER" WITH ITS "QUESTIONS."** I would like also that EPO will condescend to law (please, ladies) and will make the effort to answer (normally it is only civilized obligation), even wherein EPO cannot answer **concretely**, except to recognize the intentional crimes: natural cause of silence and of jumping to **UNLEGAL PENAL PROCEDURE**. I am very sorry, that I needed such longer space but it was only to make the detailed **exhaustive** Arguments as irrefutable against any special illegal efforts (de facto), for Humanity too. So all is simple, clear and evident and I even did not need ANY corresponding correction!

5. **VERY IMPORTANT.** Finally if illegally, EPO will not accept **finally** this demand to correct intentionally criminal International Search with consecutive avoiding (because of impossible real answer) to discuss it even at (firstly coming) EUROPEAN Search phase in transmitting this dossier **at once** to consecutive illegal penal European Examination phase (with illegal procedure). EPO must consider this letter as answer for his pretended Examination (of 23/08/2005). Of course, it will be the chosen sure penal responsibility of EPO at openly illegal procedure as open intentional Dictatorship of Organization. Thank you in forward for all. Sincerely in respecting the Court too Dr. Y. Zagayansky

RESUME (After Introductory General Part).

Even for SMALL beginning of this work, World Specialists in AIDS (including President of French National AIDS Commission) wrote: "I am not qualified to evaluate your work and again to criticize it" (for work that was already 10 years OLD!!) Of course, EPO "generalists" (normally without even PhD) are much lower, especially in developed - uncomparable grandiose Universal continuation of XXII century. Moreover, EPO knew that recently (2004) this mechanism of AIDS (with saving means) was definitively confirmed and since publication of **intentionally** destroying (with help of EPO Authority, including personally Director of Search Unity E. De Bunder) International "Search" (2002) already 9 millions of victims could be saved (= accusation of Ruling Epidemic Organization in EPO in crime against Humanity) and in spite of this, intentionally making **UNLEGAL** criminal procedure, EPO justly tried only **TO AVOID** response for its evident **intentional** simply proven crimes, in jumping at once to penal "Examination", confirming for 100% also intentionality of ALL. In taking "general (for all field) therapeutic purpose", practical therapeutic processes (nonpatentable themselves) became too simple worshipping consequences of Grandiose CORRECT proven Scientific Theory as **really** ONLY: "Let's use it against such or such disease", moreover with ready clichés of claims from Legislation (that were even searched by EPO: Claim 3 and 11). Logically to find even something specific against such particular simplicity of grandiose accepted science, EPO tried to mean another sense to term "technical features" which only means as those "which are necessary for definition of claimed subject matter" (as "fact of encoding dehydrogenases" or "intended use of product"). There were principally two global features to destroy this Archi-Application in Search and both are **TOO evident** intentional crimes. As Epidemic with ALL my other Applications ("End of Einstein-Bohr...", "End of AIDS...", "PostEinstein-Bohr definitive End... superaccelerators"), EPO did not Search "Scientific Theories" (representing 99.9% of technical solutions!) referring to Rule 39.1(f) PCT, but using this Rule oppositely. And only chance of appearing of New Edition of "PCT Guidelines" saved me. "For boys" already (with Refs to Rule 39.1(f)), Guidelines confirm the order to Search Scientific Theories if they are "applied... to produce a practical application" (one EPO Commission already confirmed this Epidemic as "pertinent"). So Examiners (logically) to avoid proven Epidemic cataclysm, make even open deception with Ref on the same Rule 39.1(f) PCT [52(2)(a) EPC], that best scientific theory rests as such because it does not support its practical claims "AT ALL". In such surely impossible case, Examiners had to ask to take off "at all" wordings of such scientific claims in dependent practical claims and such practical claims had to become **really** independent, surely without Unity of Invention, that was not stated at all. It looks as again proven open war of intentional destruction. Secondly, EPO, too openly, does not search new and inventive therapeutic **processes** (ordered by law and ingeniously underlined in claims) but pretends to search all (a priori unsearchable) substances. Incredible falsification is exemplified in claim 4: to search not all substances which inhibit (inhibitors) movement of macrophages (a priori impossible), but effect of ALL such inhibitors in process of curing of encephalitis, proven justly only by grandiose scientific theory! These two archi-grotesques (that were insistently discussed and underlined by me) were clearly sufficient "to re-make" (more precisely: to search finally all claims: 1, 2, 6, 10 and 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 31) International Search Report (intentionally completely destroyed). This intentional crime is aggravated encore by another flagrant violation of law (§9.36 "PCT Guidelines"): "Unclear claims: with regard of... unclear realizations", it is "the examiner" who "determine" "amendments" (as far as possible) and conduct the Search based on these amendments! That EPO **intentionally** even did not try at its intentional misleadings. But wherein EPO justly wrote in Report "...there is no examination on matter (almost all) which was not searched" (= 100% end of Patent without "Search", confirming such end even by changed title: only "Universal antimicrobial means" concerning only Claim 3 (with galaxy of "Xs")).

PURPOSE. (After Introductory Part and Résumé with Questions).

This is only demand to correct profoundly the intentionally penal known "Search" wherein the procedure became openly illegal, criminal only because EPO Organization demonstrates **intentional** of law because this Intergovernmental Office simply could not answer for too simple concluded arguments even of Covering Letter that proved the intentional crime. So any EPO action based on such crime is a priori criminal (as sent in criminal "procedure" a report consciously criminal "Examination", that is surely illegal, fruit of knowingly illegal procedure). Finally EPO Organization must correct known criminal International "Search", that intentionally destroyed all my International phase for all countries with High EPO Authority!! Too systematically EPO openly considers to be above the law and simply passes any my arguments without answers only because they are sure. This is reason (and also sure Ruling level of this Organization in EPO!) that, at the same time, I am sending this letter to High Collegium of European Judges and to Bundestag (Headquarters of EPO is Munich with its local penal law) DEPUTIES (Justly having Very objective proportion of Antifascist Opposition to check ALL deputies as being too spread Ruling agents also being above law) to control finally even the elementary civil answering, elementary discussion, deprived by this ruling EPO Organization that is above the law. For objectivity, only after EPO answer for ALL numbered arguments (please, elementary civilization, thank you very much in forward), I shall engage procedure against organized (sure Organization!) attempts (anyway de facto) for Brigandage of high sums of milliards and for crime against Humanity: Parallel Accusation in premeditated assassination of 9 millions of innocents known, sure, confirmed means against AIDS in this invention. Because of EPO demonstration of usurpation of any answer, any civilized discussion, in spite of even special cochise (but clear, simple) argumentation in Covering Letter, that was caused by Complete illegal EPO (and WIPO) silence for my longer argumentation at international phase, I present here THE SAME ARGUMENTS, but in detailed form "for boys" (like finally with §9.05 "PCT Guidelines").

Of course, if such International Search will be **obviously** made finally ("corrected"), it must also take into consideration **much** much less important arguments (small details), written now "for boys". Although, Examiner, himself, is OBLIGED to "determine" "amendments" (as far as possible) and conduct the Search based on these amendments "with regard of... unclear realizations" ("UNCLEAR CLAIMS" § 9.36 "PCT Guidelines"). (They contain only: a) Evidently, it is only claim 3 (justly searched) that is with real "result to be achieved" (but it is sole means to do it according to law) (§9.3); b) As I stated before, Claim 10 (scientific theory and application at the same time) had to be, **ANYWAY**, searched as a whole: as scientific theories with all their applications, but of course it is undiscussable and understandable how Examiners could manifestly violate Legislation (§14.05 "PCT Guidelines"): "In most cases industrial applicability will be self-evident" and practical using of ANY (ANY!) problem is more than self-evident (Stal)! It is outstanding exemplified grotesque of intentional manifesting destructions.

Although in view of such perfection of level and recommended by PCT Forms of Claims ("PCT and EPO Guidelines" §5.21 and CIV.4.2) [moreover accepted (made, with the same standard Form, claims 3 and 11) by EPO], on one hand, and absence of ANY real problem with even (needed?) intentional falsifications (and for what else so surely intentional?) including Epidemic order (underlining intentional destruction, independent on person), I had to change **NOTHING** in Application, except the re-adding of already corrected obvious errors (slips) (at international phase) of p.87 (claim 9) (only that cancer is included, that was well written in Description and even in Abstract). (Without any examination in these too evident obligatory cases, EPO did not take them, Again intentional criminal destruction?). Before this "Purpose", there is short "Résumé" with "Essential Questions of Résumé" (Please, to answer for each question, point by point, that will be necessary as objective reality also to Non-specialized General Penal European Collegium, wherein I shall transmit it (Accusation in International Crime against Humanity and Brigandage for Millions). After this there is "Main Text of Letter" with "Résumé of questions and confirmations" (specially numbered to answer point after point. During all Procedure, EPO intentionally did not answer for my arguments only because it is impossible a priori (that objective man (and Penal Court also) must see now), making illegal procedure. Thank you very much in forward for way to objectivity, at last.

Finally, if illegally, EPO will not accept **finally** this demand to correct the intentionally criminal International Search with consecutive avoiding (because of impossible real answer) to discuss it even at (firstly coming) EUROPEAN Search phase in transmitting this dossier **at once** to consecutive illegal penal European Examination phase (with illegal procedure). EPO must consider this letter as answer for his pretended Examination (of 23/08/2005). Of course it will be the chosen sure penal responsibility of EPO at openly illegal procedure as open intentional Dictatorship of Organization.

"Case law" and especially such the Legislation Come as T. 9823/94 and "EPO Guidelines", one can find at www.epo.org (in "Tool Box" and "Board of Appeal"). This letter has 24 pages (and also 3 now corrected pages (obvious errors) in 3 copies). ALL 24 pages are signed by me (mine) and all copies of corrected pages.

3
ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS OF RESUME.

1. But why EPO did not answer for my evident arguments at international phase and even essential concluded ones at Entry into National EPO phase, but instead EPO made illegal penal unvaluable procedure, at once (intentionally missing previous obligatory Search!!) making Examination instead of making (correcting) finally: International Search = National Search (in spite of even my justly recent special letters, only reminding Arguments of EXTREME GRAVITY with SOLVED (with new experimental data of 2004, too) AIDS situation [8000 deaths/day] but without any correction of Application)???

2. What does law have against Form of claims 3 and 11 (which is the same for all therapeutic and diagnostic claims) searched by EPO and recommended by Legislation (§5.21 and CIV.4.2 PCT and EPO Guidelines)???

3. Is Rule 6.3(b)(i) PCT correct and "technical features" mean those "which are necessary to definition of claims subject matter" (as "fact of encoding of dehydrogenases" or "intended use of product" according to Legislation)???

4. Why did EPO use Rule 39.1(f) PCT oppositely to its sense according to meaning (with Reference to this Rule) of §9.05 of "PCT Guidelines" (very fortunately newly appeared with the same PCT law and EPO Guidelines)???

5. a) Is strangely new EPO thesis, that scientific theory does not support ("at all") its practical therapeutic claims is complete deception, because, even formally, Examiner had to be obliged to ask to take off "at all" wordings of independent "scientific claims" in non-Their practical claims, and to state complete absence of Unity of Invention, that was not the case "AT ALL"???

b) And concretely factually in exemplified Claim 4: Why scientific claim 1: "motility is obligatory for contaminated macrophage entering into brain to cause encephalitis" does not substantiate (and even at all) claim 4: The use of "substances... for manufacture of medicaments against encephalitis that stop macrophage motility (inhibitors)" because of Claim 1: "motility is obligatory for contaminated macrophage entering into brain to cause the encephalitis"???

c) It is oppositely too self-evident even formally???

6. a) Too simply, why EPO did not search new, inventive therapeutic **processes** according to Law (Footnotes to Art.52(4)) even especially ingeniously cited even in these claims for S1 (b). And consequently (exemplified by Claim 4): Why does EPO pretend to search simply all inhibitors of macrophage movement (this is a priori unpredictable and unsearchable) instead of searching "only" effect of all such inhibitors in new and inventive process (in this process now and inventive according to art.7) of curing of encephalitis (because encephalitis are caused by movement of Macrophages according to YZ Sci. Theory)???

b) Why is it so open primitive destruction?

7. Is Legislation of §9.36 "PCT Guidelines" still valid? So why, at international Search, the Obligated Examiner did not do ANY such attempts with "regard of... unclear realization" to determine "amendments" (as far as possible) and to conduct search based on these amendments???

8. Did even change of title of Invention by EPO: "Universal antimicrobial treatments" confirm conclusion of International Search Report that there will be no examination for all claims (except N°3: completely "nonnew") and no patent (FINISH) **ALREADY** AFTER SUCH International "Search"???

See also: www.epo.org "Registers"

MAIN TEXT OF LETTER

I. GENERAL PART (I NEED TO CHANGE NOTHING: ONLY RE-EXPLANATION "FOR BOYS" (BECAUSE OF COMPLETELY ILLEGAL PROCEDURE WITHOUT ANY ANSWER FOR MY SURE ARGUMENTS)).

Being made perfectly, moreover, with urgency for millions of human lives, this superintention of XXI century, however, was intentionally completely PENALTY destroyed as vulgar Brigandage, accompanying by crime against Humanity, at international phase. Whereas EPO even forced now title (reflecting complete destruction) in International Publication: "Universal Antimicrobial treatment" (with only claim 3 with galaxy of "Xs" = NOTHING) and finished with this invention forever in published International Search Report: "This is case irrespective of whether or not the claims are amended following receipt of Search Report". However, it is SURELY definitively confirmed REAL mechanism of AIDS (J.Gen.Virol.85,3735,2004). THE CRIME IS TERRIBLE!

But this sure Barbarity of century (9 millions of innocents are died only from AIDS since 2002 and millions as for open Brigandage) is objectivized even by EPO itself because they claimed the invention as scientific theory. (Thanks for confirmation, it means: "which is conformed to requirements of objectivity, or precision" [Pitt Robert, Dictionnaire Robert, 2002], or it means: "valid according to the objective principles of scientific method" ("theoretical" perception of truth") [The new shorter Oxford Dictionary, 1993] or it means: "characteristic or typical of scientist especially in... absolute accuracy" [unabridged Webster's, 1993]). But in spite of such statement about this Scientific Theory, I must declare again that the level of Examiners in much lower than for this Universal Advance of century (100 pages), based on my monumental work of 300 pages (with thousands of Refs) [my cited Book with published, in "Lancet", Summary and Ref. [1] Part XI, Ref. [1] Annex (IIA): Only for small beginning of these works, President of French Academy of Sciences Jean Hamburger recommended me in Academy of Sciences (see his letter in this Ref. [1]). Only for beginning of already present work (pp.10-13 here), written in 1980, World Specialist of AIDS Prof. Zagury as well even President of French National Committee of AIDS Prof. Rozenbaum wrote in 1999!! "I am not qualified to evaluate your work and again to criticize it" [published in YZ: "1998: Coup d'Etat fasciste by Agents: Philip, Camus, Joliot-Curie, Thoroz, Togliatti (and Boris Vian) assassinated", ISBN: 2-910658-05-8, 2000]. And only President of French Institution, World Specialist of AIDS and World Star, Main Editor of prestigious Journal G.Methé had corresponding level to write (even for Paper of 10 years OLD!!) [pp.10-13 here]: "With felicitations for remarkable Work" (published Ild and EPO has in dossier with Filing!).

But present invention is MUCH more grandiose. Even THE MOST great World Academicians (each in narrow field) could really realize this Great World Revolution (as a whole) for level of criticism during months with thousands references. But EPO Examiners (with general knowledge, who logically even do not have simple PhD) even did not read it one time seriously, because SURELY they had to ask me Ref. [1] of Part X, which I omitted as slip (at beginning). Certainly they understand (not less than Grand Professors, specialized only in AIDS) that their level is much much less of World Revolution. But they DICTATE arbitrary (also as surely ordered Epidemic with Rule 39.1(7)) over in Science: for instance: their Abstract (as specially for destruction) is de facto unreadable. Taking only best "general therapeutic purposes" "covering the whole field of therapy" (T.04382) after such Great Science ("Scientific Theory"), one takes only simple short recommended wordings to claim the BEST "scientific theory" for practical utility. And such best Patent must be impossible to deny. So intentional penal Epidemic of destruction (see Rule 39.1 (7)) is too evident a priori.

A. SCIENTIFIC THEORIES WITH THEIR APPLICATIONS-REFORMULATIONS HAD TO BE SEARCHED. I obviously follows that EPO pure Epidemic Organization (without dependence on person) projected simple Brigandage of all my three patents for millennia with simple universal means (even after ideal 1st Search of 2000, as 1st Miracle, conducting to our important Patent formally according to law, yet without Epidemic). EPO arbitrarily considered that "scientific theories" being base of all these Applications ("End of Einstein-Bohr...", "End of AIDS...", "Post-Einstein-Bohr definitive End: superaccelerators...") are not Searched (even being not "as such" but with their Applications) at all with EPO's references to Rules 39.1(7) [87.1(1)] PCT. As in this case, by sure ordered Epidemic, any EPO Commission (and even Board!) did not discuss my even elementary arguments during years! As "Too complex: so no comments even for 3 x 3 = 9".

SO TOO SIMPLY, OPENLY AND WITHOUT DOUBT, FORMALLY AND CONCRETELY-FORMALLY, EPO (AS TOTALITARIAN EPIDEMIC WITH ALL MY OTHER APPLICATIONS) USED INTENTIONALLY OPPOSITE SENSE OF KNOWN PCT RULE 39.1(7).

CLAIM 10. As it was written at international and National phases, Claim 10 [being process "upon living things", that are patentable ("PCT Guidelines" §5.12)] was not searched by EPO [against law: Rule 39.1(7) PCT] in invention as a whole: complete General Scientific Theory (with claims 6, 1 and 2) with ALL its Applications. But moreover, it could be searched even "twice". As being new process of synthesis of ANY (ANY!) applied protein, it is surely even the best example for §14.05 ("Ibid"): "In most cases, industrial applicability will be self-evident and no more explicit description on this point will be required". That other Applications (from Legislation), even in much less trivial cases, followed de facto ["Method of purifying proteins", T.01508 (EP313343), no ANY! word for also obvious using in such even specially done invention; "Methods of preparation of heterologous proteins" "Case Law", T.091694; T.043096; T.031093). It is shame (as it would be in above cited works, that "Board of Appeals" did not ask) to explain that any protein, at least (at least), could be as "building block" for compounds of pharmaceutical, cosmetic, food, fermentative or chemical industries. It is not even as newly synthesized methan for Chemical industry but as ANY aliphatic compound! Exemplary SHAME even "for boys".

B. IT IS NEW AND INVENTIVE THERAPEUTIC PROCESS THAT HAD TO BE SEARCHED ACCORDING TO LAW (Footnotes of Art.52(4) EPC). BUT INSTEAD, EPO PRETENDED TO SEARCH ALL SUBSTANCES THAT IS A PRIORI IMPOSSIBLE, UNLEGAL (in all these cases) AND INTENTIONAL THAT WAS CONFIRMED AGAIN BY CRIMINAL "PROCEDURE".

ALL WAS DONE JUSTLY PERFECTLY: ALL practical therapeutic claims were done as clear stereotype, wherein it is new and inventive process of curing that had to be searched according to law [or rather "effect of the substance" ("Methods for treatment of human... "EPO Guidelines" §VIII-2)] with always given examples, wherein application of ALL other substances (with particular determined functions) in ALL these cases could be easily done too that "allows the invention to be (ONLY) PERFORMED (Ild CII-4.9) in the whole range claimed" "Case Law", p.147 par 4. Wherein I took the best way of "general therapeutic purpose", "covering the whole field of therapy" [§5.12, p.88 "Case Law", T.4382]. Moreover, I just took the Form of Claims, PRESCRIBED by PCT and EPO Legislation (PCT and EPO Guidelines: § 5.21 and §CIV-4.2), making very precise Reference for Art.52(4) EPC IN CLAIM, justly to guarantee sure Search of process according to Footnotes of this Art.52(4). Of course, it is the best solution of form of such claims [justly "PCT and EPO Guidelines" §5.21 and CIV-4.2: "substance X for use as medicament for curing disease Y". Wherein moreover, in addition to take the above prescribed Form, I specially wanted to avoid Search of substances, making even IN CLAIMS the effective Reference to Art.52(4) with its Footnotes, ORDERING to search the new inventive PROCESS!!! And even after such drastic efforts, Qualified Examiners do not make such Search of intentionally asked (and even explained specially again in New Covering letter!) PROCESS. What anyone can do more in History of Patents?! Of course, it looks as sure penal intentional SABOTAGE (as with Epidemic Rule 39.1(7)). Moreover such or such Form of these claims does not matter (T.095804). So I left these claims in their best prescribed (and even well specifying) Form and BOTH times (without any answer for evident explanations), EPO criminally intentionally OPENLY did not do the Search. (My modest attempt (that changed nothing in known reality) to adapt to Examiners in changing several rules in claims at international phase was without any answer: so I took best, TOO OBVIOUS, original PRESCRIBED claims (with such form open searched by EPO in claims 3 and 11), that, moreover, underlines intentionally, of sabotage, WITHOUT DOUBT, SMALL MODIFICATIONS OF PRESCRIBED (and specifying) CLAIMS DO (DID NOT MATTER!!).

AT PROCESSES, "result to be achieved" is nonsense a priori (in claims 4, 5, 9, 11, 12). It is undiscussable even "for boys" that at finally correct "Search", that must be done according to law, finally) but of new and inventive therapeutic processes (claims 4, 5, 9, 11, 12), there is no question about strange unexisting imagination of "result to be achieved" in these claims. For instance, in claim 4, Too strangely and intentionally, Examiner pretends (who can guess in reality, that I try to patent all substances which inhibit macrophage movement (this is "result to be achieved") that to outstandingly nonsense [and it is impossible because these inhibitors have unpredictable structures (see §10)]. I patent effect of ALL inhibitors of macrophage movement on new and inventive process curing from oncephalitis due to curing of great technical problem as a whole with scientific theory.

And only real now Miracle saved ALL my Patents from SURELY ORGANIZED CRIMINAL EVIDENT BRIGANDAGE! Suddenly, in new Edition (2004) of "PCT Guidelines" that are "common rules of international search and examination" "and assist in the application of provisions of the PCT (international LAW which was THE SAME, except small other additions" (§1.03 Ild), the too direct straight STIPULATION ("for boys" already) of above Rules (with their Refs) firstly appeared, proving Openness (to law), Epidemic, Organized intentional falseness of any (since EPO of 2000) concerned qualified EPO Examiner: "When viewing... as a whole, if the theories are applied or implemented to produce a practical application... search is required SINCE THE RESULT IS NOT PURELY ABSTRACT OR INTELLECTUAL" (§9.05 with Refs to Rules 39.1(7) and 67.1(1), wherein, I repeat, it is clearly written about such scientific theories, which are ALREADY "applied, to produce (THEIR) practical applications" and which must be searched). "Since the result is not purely abstract or intellectual" means that with their practical consequences, there is no any more PURELY abstract intellectual result. Utilization of such Rules 39.1(7) PCT [§2 (2) (a) EPC] are exemplified (in corresponding Guidelines) ONLY by concrete examples of pure absence of practical consequences of pure theory.

But it means that 99.9% of surely proven results, that represent one century in forward, were criminally ignored in such "Search". Wherein, moreover, these best confirmed results had to protect against alleged accidental works ("X" and "Y" in "search" with solo claim 3). (So at 1st reaction, one EPO Commission ALREADY accepted such INTENTIONAL EPIDEMIC CRIME as "prior art").

Imagination, that the common Scientific (CORRECT) Theory (in this Application) does not support ALL (AND AT ALL!) practical claims, would be even formally (a priori) fantastical intentional penal falseness. Such TOO exceptional case of alien scientific theories for separated practical applications was even not mentioned AT ALL in International Search Report. It is already impossible as fantastical bungle of unchallenged falseness. In such case, Examiners had to ask (in International Search) to take off all unrelated (it means: WRONG, misleading for this application) features (and even their mentioning) of independent (as a whole) claims of scientific theory in ALL such dependent practical claims that SURELY is not the case. Moreover, EPO did not prove such very unusual strange even UNEXEMPLIFIED CASE (in PCT and EPO "Guidelines") without even any example of claim TO SHOW it (it would be IMPOSSIBLE FOR QUALIFIED EPO COMMISSION and flagrantly against law which stipulates "ANY such restriction to search... SHOULD BE accompanied by reasonable explanation" "PCT Guidelines" §9.03). But MOREOVER, such numerous independent practical claims had to become REALLY factually independent. (And not formally, as searching of new and inventive and practical therapeutic processes although they are not patentable themselves only because of humanitarian considerations of facilitated doctor's uses of therapy.) In such absurdity, OBVIOUSLY, there will be DEMONSTRATION, MANIFESTATION, EXHIBITION of flagrant absence of Unity of Invention, that EPO did not state AT ALL it will be fantastical too!

Moreover, this already proven scientific theory about THE REAL END OF AIDS was again definitively WELL confirmed (J.Gen.Virol. 85,3735,2004) (that means my sure Nobel Prize) and these therapeutic Applications are only REFORMULATIONS (to see concrete cases in §1) of BEST CORRECT scientific theory as ONLY FORMALLY: "Let's use it for such curing" ("Scientific... as it was accepted by EPO, means: precise). For instance, Claim 4 asks: The use of "substances... for manufacture of medicaments against encephalitis that stops macrophage motility (inhibitors)", because "according to claim 1" "motility is obligatory for contaminated macrophage entering into brain to cause the encephalitis". To pretend that claim 1 (correct scientific theory) does not support (moreover AT ALL!) claim 4 would be OPEN formal obligatory dictatorial deception and without doubt at all Moreover without such claim 1 (scientific theory), Claim 4 will be: The use of substances... for manufacture of medicaments against encephalitis, to stop macrophage motility. LIKE THIS without any experiments or any scientific theory. THIS SIMPLE DECLARATION IS IMPOSSIBLE. But the same was with "SEARCHED" claim 3: "The viral exterior proteins... for manufacture of medicaments for vaccinations against viruses with minimal possible quantity (as one) of viral neutralizing-epitopes... that must be taken for immunization". LIKE THIS without any experiments or any scientific theory. It is impossible fantastical nonsense to patent, although intentional EPO's destroying

"For always (see in situ) given examples" (my letter of 02/07/03, §2a), EPO persists to deny it (it is really very strange). So one can really GUESS (that again usurps law), that it is again due to such intentionally wrong penal absurd strategy (without sense) of "Search" (see above) and due TO THE BEST "GENERAL therapeutic purpose" (that is not patentable itself) "covering the whole field of therapy" [which can be justified only with object of therapy (as macrophages) and disease for curing (as different encephalitis)]. T.012882; T.063083; T.057493 (EP155922); T.092600 ("Case Law", p.86, T.4382, T.3883). [It means that any particular process of therapy "could be carried out" (Art.5 PCT) with this general purpose]. So wherein EPO really imagines that "for non of such medicaments" there is no support in Description and Claims (Art.5, 6 PCT) giving only clichés of general words to ANY claim (that could be used for ANY of millions of inventions). Although Legislation stipulates: "As general rule, claim is regarded as supported by the description unless, exceptionally, there are WELL-FOUNDED reasons..." ("PCT Guidelines" §5.44). "Assumption or hypothesis about possible obstacle to successful realization of the project must always be based on facts" ("TECHNICAL FACTS") "Case Law", p.273, p.118; T.20784. "Any such restriction for the Search... should be accompanied by reasonable explanation" (but not universal clichés) ("PCT Guidelines" §9.03).

So why ELSE "always given examples" (§2a of my letter 02/07/03) are not examples for claims 4, 5, 7(8), 9 and 12? (I am sorry for nonsense of question "for boys"). Moreover, HERE this is ALWAYS the OBVIOUS case when "there is no reason to suppose that the invention cannot be carried out through the whole field claimed" (Ild §5.53). Because ALL substances in all above claims (as ANY inhibitor of macrophages in claim 4) could be applied easily, "without undue difficulty" as the example. So claims must be "acceptable even in a broad scope" (Ild §5.53).

(1) In Claim 4, Why ELSE inhibitors of beta-chemokine receptors (as example of very specific anti-receptor antibodies) are not good against encephalitis??? [I even gave (one line above and below) the Refs for Manuals for TOO ROUTINE preparing of antibodies that is absolutely not necessary ("EPO Guidelines" §CII-4.4)] as in a lot of other inventions (including Legislation), (see also §II-2a). (2) In Claim 7(8), Why ELSE specially inserted, even in claim, well characterized examples of Du-ZT protein (of IgG) (being even "X" in "Search") (and even other ones) are not good for well characterized family of such proteins with the same characteristics??? (see also §II-1).

(3) In Claim 9, Why ELSE a large number of examples of charged (and even inserted in text) polymers of Prior Art and exemplified means (see also §Ic) of their conjugation with specific antibodies are not good against mentioned diseases???

(4) In Claim 11, Why ELSE other derivatives of PIP(2) and gammaGTP (which all [with PIP(2) too]) participate in "functioning of these transport vesicles [1]" p.75-31? Irreversible stopping of which provokes coma- see also §Ic) are not good against coma? In Claim 12, why ELSE the partial inhibitors of "cycle of the synaptic and "PKC" transporting and conducting vesicles" (as example of diluted cyanates) (wherein "consciousness (is) the reflection of the cyclic system of the neurons with chaotic transport cycles of (such) vesicles [1]" are not good against insomnia?... Sorry, I did not make the special trap: VITAL Ref.1 (Part XI) was omitted (at beginning) as obvious slip (see also §Ic) and Examiners (at Search) even did not ask me to present it. SO SURELY they did not really read the text (wherein even BEST World specialized Profs wrote about their impossibility to criticize- see beginning of §I) and [1], in writing SURELY INTENTIONALLY such Universal strong wording without obligatory "well founded reasons" for all claims and all inventions.

(5) In Claim 5, in "general therapeutic (diagnostic) purpose", "covering the whole field of therapy (diagnosis)" "Case Law" p.88, T.4382) at searching of this new inventive diagnostic process (which even is not patentable itself), invention solves grandiose technical problem as a whole (WITH penalty forbidden scientific theory) [with claim 1 (1-5, §I): resolving (firstly) real virus contamination and] approaching of the conditions of such contamination in vivo to virus diagnosis. So such new DECISIVE particularly for numerous old classical diagnoses of different viruses (since Pasteur!!) (classified writing in many handbooks, textbooks, manuals [=" general knowledge" which are known to skilled man (§CII-4.1 "EPO Guidelines") and are not necessary to cite [Ild CII-4.4 (and CII-4.1): Already Complete Invention for skilled man who knows Manuals], although there are such Great Manuals in Text as "Fields Virology" with several thousands!! pages and tens of thousands of Refs). Practically: it is too simple use with antibodies finally (as for REAL AIDS (2nd phase)) and also "for nonproductive contamination of

viruses in vitro" (p.47-23) (is rather for theoretical problems at 1ST phase) with simple concentration gradient of chemokines [at routine exemplary simplicity of: "agent is APPLIED in a gradient of concentration" as US6472166 or, for instance, Handbook LBogard "Biologie Moléculaire en biologie clinique. I. Méthodes", Elsevier, 1993]. Such Description is classical (T 3/89, T 63/94, T 77/92, T 310/99, T 120/00). T 3/89: Claim 6 and 7 "Test kit, comprising:..... c) other suitable reagents". That had as variants: Claims 6 and 7: "Test kit, comprising:..... (already without Sc: "other suitable reagents") (see also claim 10 of T 310/99). This diagnosis can be written as METHOD equally: "A method for... comprising the steps of:..." ("Case Law" p.30: T 77/92; T 310/99). See also §1-1a here. Why Examiners wrote for this claim that "the application provides support for none of such kits" (ONLY comprising antibodies)? [In reality it is only one kit ("The kit": claim 5) comprising different possibilities of nonpatentable classical parts as do classically others: see Legislation: T_0003/89, 0003/94, 0775/92, 0310/99, 0120/00]

ANYWAY AT SOME NONCLARITY, ACCORDING TO LEGISLATION ("PCT GUIDELINES" §9.36) IT IS THE EXAMINER WHO MUST "PROVE" IN FRENCH/AMEND SUCH CLAIM AND MAKE SEARCH (communicating amendment effort) EVEN (even!) AT SUCH CASE, Examiner had to correct (as possible) above claims himself and to make Search of ALL above claims anyway!

c). **SPECIAL IGNORING OF CORRECTED PAGES (with sure slips in only list of references).** Like continuing such surely intentional line, EPO, insistently, even did not explain the open ignoring of corrected slips, moreover consisting only of inserting of the "coordinates" of several journals in their list (only at the end: in "Supplement": p.82 and 87), that were described and even numbered in main text. **IT SURELY looks the same as one inserts one reference instead of another (by mistake: slip), wherein there is no any doubt that such corrections of slips is TOO common.**

It looks like OPEN wish of destruction (again for Brigandage as Rule 39.1(i) by any unknown (to me) EPO Officer at Epidemic order of Organization?) at International and National EPO phase even in such undefensible case. Slips (obvious errors) could be corrected any time (Rule 91 PCT). The official text, that it is "obvious" error, that "anyone would immediately recognize that nothing else could be intended other than the offered rectification" (§8.01 "PCT Guidelines"), is obviously satisfied. Nobody will omit only "coordinates" of described and even numbered references in their list in hoping to find their existence after filing (without publications, at Science of XXI century, I was not pressed neither). It is already impossible, except obvious error. But as it was written in "Covering letter" (for National phase), moreover, Refs.6-8 (Part VI) (p.82) are taken from my retired Appl. PCT/FR97/01706, wherein the same unpatentable example of conjugation was "very easily done" (p.48-24 here) (routinely classical means, with some "Prior Art" modifications: Refs. 6-8) and I only specially worked to **re-write text** more concisely with the same Refs. (undoubtedly 100% obvious error), and EPO (as ISA) has this Application. But I am sending here the signed Refs. as photocopy of Appl. PCT/FR97/01706, proving, as TOO certain, the obvious error. Justly the same missing of "coordinates" of Refs. is in p.87, that are also unpatentable background of previous art and I took ALL their Refs from also retired PCT/FR98/02334, in only re-writing the small part of this invention [see photocopy of including corresponding Refs (pp.13-14 of PCT/FR98/02334 = Refs.1 of Part XI and Refs.1-8 of Annex IIA here)].

But moreover, it is not only TOO obvious slips with 100% direct proofs of retired Applications with the same general content. But even if there were no such direct proofs for factual errors, it is only coordinates of Refs of prior unpatentable described numbers Prior Art! ONLY "references to the prior art" after filing must be (but only) purely factual (always permitted when factual) ("EPO Guidelines" CII-4.3) and "references to the prior art" could be amended **always, even** when "applicant seeks to amend Description" in special unallowed way! ("PCT and EPO Guidelines" §20.10, §CIV-5.3). Moreover, the references (to prior art) not only could be "introduced at a later date" but, at special circumstances, even "should be incorporated in description" ("PCT and EPO Guidelines" §4.26 and §CII-4.18). Consequently justly persistent silence of EPO must be also obviously intentional, like because EPO only cannot deny obligatory OBVIOUS accepting of such too simple slip (as only "coordinates" of references moreover) corrections: so EPO certainly must have the usurped right to grab in silence (in such case but like anyway).

THE SIB CONCERNED INTENTIONAL PERNAL ARBITRARY OF NONSEARCHING OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 6 and 10, MADE EVEN PERFECTLY (AS EPIDEMIC, EPO APPLIED OPPOSITELY RULE 39.1 (i) PCT) AND THE SIB ALSO CONCERNED EVEN PERFECTLY WRITTEN IN PRESCRIBED FORM WITH INTELLIGENT PRECISION) CLAIMS 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, WHICH WERE NOT SEARCHED (OR WRONGLY "SEARCHED" AS CLAIM 3) ONLY BECAUSE OF INTENTIONAL CRIMINAL IGNORING OF SPECIALLY WRITTEN LAW EVEN IN CLAIM (Art. 52(4), FOOTNOTES, EPC).

11
"Let's utilize, diagnostics, COMPRIZING such concentration gradients of chemokines to approach the natural conditions of 1st contamination in vivo to this diagnostics of HIV". The substantiation (with only elementary reformulation) by scientific theory of general diagnostic application is undismissible. It looks also as comprising Diagnostics as in exemplified Claim 3 of T 120/00 (for instance). (The same for the 2nd phase determination). **IT IS NOT ALL KITS THAT MUST BE SEARCHED, IT IS ONLY EFFECT OF APPLICATION OF COMPRISED CORRESPONDING CONCENTRATION GRADIENT (OR ANTI-ENV ANTIBODIES) IN ANY CLASSICAL DIAGNOSTICS TO KNOW PRECISE VIRUS TITER, THAT MUST BE SEARCHED AS NEW AND INVENTIVE ACCORDING TO LAW (ART. 52(4) EPC (Footnote).**

b). **Claim 9.** Again, it is also new inventive therapeutic process (to search as process according to law order) against AIDS, autoimmune diseases, cancer (as written in Specification) using charged affine molecules (as antibodies), exemplified with affine molecules attached with special charged N-acyl activated derivatives to existing charged polymers ("EPO Guidelines" §CII-6.5), wherein other charged affine molecules can be also applied "without undue difficulty". **IT IS NOT ALL CHARGED AFFINE MOLECULES THAT MUST BE SEARCHED, IT IS EFFECT OF EXEMPLIFIED APPLICATION (THERAPEUTIC PROCESS) OF SUCH MOLECULES AGAINST AIDS, AUTOIMMUNE AND ALLERGIC DISEASES AND CANCER THAT MUST BE SEARCHED AS NEW AND INVENTIVE ACCORDING TO LAW (ART. 52(4) EPC (Footnote).**

According to scientific theory (a) it is harmful antibodies that help fatally to provoke AIDS (and allergic or autoimmune diseases) (b) induced surface charges can perturb functioning of cell, producing these harmful antibodies (or functioning of cancer cells with help of charged specific antibody against specific surface molecules (as carbohydrates) of such cells). So let's particularly utilize as "general therapeutic purpose", "covering the whole field of therapy", the charged antibodies against surface molecules of cell producing antibodies (or cancer cells) to stop production of harmful antibodies at such diseases (or to kill specifically cancer cells).

c). **Claim 11.** Again, it is also new inventive therapeutic process (to search as process according to law order) against state of clinical death and coma using phosphatidylinositol-4,5-bisphosphate (PIP(2)) and its derivatives or GTP-gammaS molecules. According to new scientific theory, stock exhaustion of PIP(2) provokes irreversible stopping of transporting neuron ("PKC") vesicles (it is justly so called "apoptosis"), closed chains of which (in neuron networks) determine the conscience. So as general therapeutic application, let's use such PIP(2) (etc) molecules against clinical death and coma (definitive loss of conscience), (but not against apoptosis as such). (All these substances can be applied "without undue difficulty"). **IT IS NOT ALL MEANS THAT STOP IRREVERSIBLE INHIBITION OF CIRCULAR TRANSPORTING NEURON AND HEART ("PKC") VESICLES (DETERMINING "APOPTOSIS"), PROVOKING CLINICAL DEATH AND COMA, THAT MUST BE SEARCHED, BUT EFFECT OF DERIVATIVES OF PIP(2) AND SPECIAL GTP (THERAPEUTIC PROCESS) IT TOOK NARROWER CLAIM THAN COULD, AGAINST CLINICAL DEATH AND COMA, THAT MUST BE SEARCHED AS NEW AND INVENTIVE ACCORDING TO LAW (ART. 52(4) EPC (Footnote).**

d). **Claim 12.** Again, it is also new inventive therapeutic process (to search as process according to law order) against insomnia using substances which inhibit movement of vesicular closed synaptic vesicles ("PKC" vesicles) transport at neuron network, exemplified with diluted cyanate, wherein other inhibitors of such process can be also applied "without undue difficulty". According to scientific theory, the keeping awake is determined by functioning working cycle of closed vesicular synaptic transports of network of neurons (of superior brain) and there are substances that partially inhibit such cycle (as cyanate). So let's use against insomnia, as general therapeutic application, such diluted cyanate (and other inhibitors of closed cycles), diminishing working functioning of such cycles. **IT IS NOT PARTIAL INHIBITORS OF "PKC" AND SYNAPTIC ("PKC") VESICLES THAT MUST BE SEARCHED, BUT EFFECT OF APPLICATION OF THESE EXEMPLIFIED SUBSTANCES AGAINST INSOMNIA THAT MUST BE SEARCHED AS NEW AND INVENTIVE ACCORDING TO LAW (ART. 52(4) EPC (Footnote).**

e). **Claim 3.** Again, it is new and inventive therapeutic PROCESS (according to law: TO SEARCH as process) against encephalitis, using the inhibitors against MØ movement (against beta-chemokine receptors-R), exemplified by anti-receptor antibodies.

10
These both EPO global absurd (but even they worked!) were well discussed at International and National phases without any EPO answer and action to correct (in reality to make finally) International Search. All above witnesses already about complete absence of Search for all claims due to intentional panel simple destruction of profound and well made invention.

But if such International Search will be OBLIGINGLY made ("corrected") anyway, it must also take into consideration much less important but self-evident details, written now "for boys" already at such subjectivity (as with Rule 39.1(i) PCT), although I had to change nothing in Application. Anyway, after (finally) making ("correcting") International Search, one can criticize it.

II. **CONCRETIZATIONS.** "For boys" already.

§1. **Detailed Claim 8 (other therapeutic claims are analogous).**

This claim is the simplest utilization and too simple evident sequence of proven "scientific theory". It is new and inventive therapeutic process (according to law: TO SEARCH as process) against a number of very important diseases using corresponding new small proteins "Du-2T" of claim 7. (Claim 7 is new direct product of precise Global Universal scientific theory of century that proved (it is not even as sufficient "presupposed scientific appraisal" "Case Law" p.118, T 207/94) new great laws of protein functioning (including all membranous receptors). Wherein Universal small proteins ("Du-2T") are (1) perfectly characterized by a number of their vital functions, (2) all are easily obtainable (p.75-3) [but certainly they are much stronger determined than "product-by-process" with help of scientific theory of century] and (3) are exemplified by several really obtained small proteins as sure Du-2T or that of MHC I alpha chain (according to "EPO Guidelines" §CII-6.5 and "PCT Guidelines" §5.58) [wherein all other "Du-2T" can be analogically purified too, due to their Universal properties, proven by Great scientific theory]. According to scientific theory, the nonfunctional dissociation of these small proteins provokes these diseases as Mad Cow! The real practical therapeutic part is only simple reformulation of the best scientific theory as: "Let's use this science for such curing, taking it as "general therapeutic purpose", "covering the whole field of therapy" [§5.12, p.88 "Case Law", T 43/82 with help of Art.52(4) (2nd part) EPO] it means, "let's simply use such small proteins "Du-2T" for association with their "apo" proteins against corresponding diseases (all "Du-2T" are analogically applied "without undue difficulty" of simple naive association)". It is simple end.

The rest is only adaptation to forms prescribed for therapy by PCT-EPC Legislation. Simply for such Therapeutic Application [Art.52(4)], I use justly the form prescribed by PCT and EPO Legislation ("PCT Guidelines" §5.21, "EPO Guidelines" §CIV-4.2): "Substance "X" for use as medicament for curing disease Y". And referred prescriptions of direct Footnote of Art.52(4) EPC always ORDER, that at above form of claims (ibid §5.21 and CIV-4.2), Search (and Patent) must be done "for specified new and inventive therapeutic application". Wherein, justly for such Application, **IT IS "effect of the substance" that is searched** ("Methods for treatment of the human..." "EPO Guidelines" §BIII-2) **IT IS NOT ALL SMALL PROTEINS THAT ARE SEARCHED IN CLAIM 8, IT IS ONLY EFFECT OF EXEMPLIFIED APPLICATION (THERAPEUTIC PROCESS) OF THESE SMALL PROTEINS AGAINST CORRESPONDING DISEASES THAT MUST BE SEARCHED AS NEW AND INVENTIVE ACCORDING TO LAW (ART. 52(4) EPC (Footnote).**

§2. **Other analogous Therapeutic and diagnostic unsearched Claims 5, 8, 11, 12, 4.** Only after concrete answer on very detailed §1 (claim 8), the answer must be done on particularities of these analogous therapeutic claims with the same intentional nonsense of OPPOSITE use of Rule 39.1(i) PCT and Footnotes of Art.52(4) EPC.

a). **Claim 5.** It is also new inventive process (to search as PROCESS according to order of law) of diagnostics of body fluids or tissues for virus (as HIV) titers (that for instance, absent for AIDS because of total falseness of such process nowadays) using new particular technical features proven by "scientific theory". Of course, for unpatented (as itself) but searched process of diagnosis, the best claims are as with the same case of therapy (see §1): "general therapeutic (diagnostic) purpose", "covering the whole field of therapy (diagnostics)" [Case Law", p.88, T.43/82" with help of the same Art.52(4) (2nd part) EPO].

According to scientific theory, beta-chemokine secretion serves as the chemoattractant substances for macrophage (MØ) movement... wherein... these beta-chemokines with their corresponding receptors conjoin the MØ by HIV at 1st contamination. Again, let's reformulate for practical diagnostic methods:

12
According to scientific theory, it is proven that MØ movement with help of beta-chemokine Rα provokes encephalitis and simple perturbing of such movement with help of inhibition of these receptors ceases encephalitis. The real practical therapeutic part is only simple reformulation of the best scientific theory as "Let's use this science for such curing", taking it as "general therapeutic purpose", "covering the whole field of therapy". So let's use the inhibitors of macrophage movement (inhibitors of beta-chemokine Rα) to cease encephalitis.

This new and inventive searching therapeutic PROCESS was exemplified with anti-receptor antibodies. Consequently too evidently, all such inhibitors of MØ (of beta-chemokine R) could be easily applied that "allows the invention to be PERFORMED (YZ: ONLY PERFORMED)" ("EPO Guidelines" CII-4.9) in the whole range claimed ("Case Law", p.147, par 4). But even if "a meaningful search over the whole of the claim (were) impossible" [But why? It is complete nonsense in this case: only to apply any inhibitor of such MØ receptors, only to perform invention!], "Search Division will carry out the Search on the basis of" "specific examples" ("EPO Guidelines" BIII-3). I only followed such EPO instructions and did not want to use other examples of inhibition of beta-chemokine receptors of MØ (before 2002), having fantastically different unpredictable structures: piperazine-based (J.Med.Chem. 44, 3343, 2001); spirodiketopiperazine (J.Biol.Chem. 276, 35194, 2001); Aminooxydantes-RANTES (AIDS Res. Hum. Retroviruses 1, 861, 1999); truncated by protease RANTES (J. Biol. Chem. 273, 7222, 1998); Distamycin analog (J. Leukoc. Biol. 64, 6, 1998); anti-CCR5 antibodies (J. Virol. 73, 1719, 1999); AD101 (small molecule with 4 benzene rings in chain) [PHAS 99(1), 395, 2002]. After date of filing, quantity of such VERY different inhibitors with unpredictable structures became tremendous. I do not patent all such inhibitors (so called without any sense "result to be achieved" by Examiners), it was never written. I patent any such substances only in using for prevention of encephalitis, wherein all of them could be easily applied TO PERFORM invention ("EPO Guidelines" CII-4.9).

IT IS NOT ALL INHIBITORS OF BETA-CHEMOKINE RECEPTORS OF MØ THAT ARE SEARCHED IN CLAIM 4, IT IS ONLY EFFECT OF EXEMPLIFIED APPLICATION (THERAPEUTIC PROCESS) OF THESE INHIBITORS AGAINST ENCEPHALITIS AS NEW AND INVENTIVE ACCORDING TO LAW (ART. 52(4) EPC (Footnote). §3. **Claim 3.** Searched but intentionally without scientific theory resulting in unjustified "Xa" due to such intentional illegality (oppositely to Rule 39.1(i) PCT). Please to re-search with complete technical features (as a whole).

(By irony of fantastical exemplary arbitrariness, this is sole claim with real "result to be achieved" in claim, however it was SOLE claim that was "searched" (JUSTLY WITH DISCREDITING ALL LARGE QUANTITY OF PREUDO "Xa", misinforming this VITAL medicinal invention (it could be tens and tens of SUCH "Xa" "it but claims 4, 5, 8, 11, 12 were not searched because of simply pseudo "result to be achieved" in these claims).

Again, it is new and inventive therapeutic process (to re-search as process according to order of law) against antibody-dependent enhancement of virus entry against (a) viral diseases using, for vaccination, viral interior proteins with "minimally possible" quantity of different epitopes, exemplified by discovered facilitation (and even possibility) to enter for HIV virus particles with heterogeneous antibodies against heterogeneous env proteins. Wherein Fc receptors (helping to entry) are the same for all antibodies against all viruses.

According to new scientific theory, "the heterogeneity of the env viral proteins is generally absolutely necessary for the HIV consecutive productive contamination". So "one easily eliminates the grave unpredictable effects during the vaccinations since Pasteur" (p.47-6) in taking for immunization minimally possible quantity of viral neutralising epitopes, obtained from minimally possible quantity of homogenous clones (finally). So as general therapeutic application, let's use such generally minimized heterogeneity of epitopes to avoid grave unpredictable (since Pasteur!) terrible (mortal) effects of vaccinations (babes included). Justly here, the practical claim is defined by reference to "result to be achieved" ("EPO Guidelines" CII-4.7). And they "may be allowed if the invention, can only be defined in such terms". Justly such harmful amplification of vaccination (as well neutralization) can only be generally predictable and at such harmful effect obtained, according to principal technical feature of this claim, one must diminish quantity of different epitopes to avoid it (in conserving yet positive neutralization, which must, naturally, diminish too). It is obvious prescription of famous "routine trial and error" (ibid CIV-2.2, T.035/91, §6.2). And it is tremendous problem, for instance, because of such harmfulness (with

unknown yet remedies to Humanity!), "there is no licensed vaccine against dengue fever" (justly in "EPO Search's" RaviPrakash et al). However, because of dengue, there is 5 millions of hospitalizations of only children and 70000 deaths each year (Mirus-Gebres 23, 85, 2004; Vaccine 23, 849, 2005). Pity for innocent babies, please, in Dear Intentional Obstructions, Dear Intergovernmental EPIDEMIC ORGANIZATION!

So even only this would make tremendous success with realizing finally molecular medical science, if there were no intentional criminal EPO obstruction. Critically found by EPO, without obligatory scientific theory, "Xs" (it could be tons and tons of such "Xs") are at least "accidental anticipation" (like common chemical compounds at only one step of "entirely different reactions yielding different and products"), "without being a common technical problem" and "person skilled in art would never have taken it into consideration when making the invention" ("EPO Guidelines", CVI-5.3.11; "Law case", p.65)

Very numerous utilizations (as such) of different homogeneous or proteins for immunization (a large number of EPO "Xs" as small parts) have nothing with problem to overcome unpredictable negative effects of dangerous increases of viral infection due to immunization, resolved in claim 3 due to NEW scientific knowledge with consequence: Intentionally to diminish number of different epitopes, conserving neutralization as purpose of immunization. (Moreover, in THIS EPO Search's "EP432920", it could be easily several epitopes. The most often real epitopes are those of carbohydrate chains (that are invisible in protein primary structure), which themselves could have several epitopes. And without such international search, nobody would move in such direction: to diminish quantity of carbohydrates in chain or to change host of expression of DNA vector).

Even if there is some (unclear for examiner) wording in realizations, it is "the examiner (who) determines the subject of search on the subject matter which must be reasonably claimed by AMENDMENT (that examiner must communicate AFTER Search)!!!... and conduct the search based on the determined subject" ("PCT Guidelines" §5.38). And I never saw such positive Examiner amendments for Search finally (except the sure negatively intentional as with SURE (SURE, criminal and COMMON, not depending on personality of Examiner) EPIDEMIC "Rule 39.10 PCT") (see also EVEN (EVEN), "reformulation of problem that could be allowed" "Case Law", p.108; "PCT Guidelines" §520.09; 20.10; 20.15).

§4. PSEUDO-ABSENCE OF NOVELTY WITH DEVELOPMENTS OF CENTURY.

a). Claim 11. Let's be reasonable, please (not like with PROVEN intentional crime with Rule 39.1(f)). Again viewing the claims as a whole and with WHOLE scientific theory is obligatory ("PCT Guidelines" §9.05). And work of Majilano et al (inhibition of apoptosis by increasing PIP(2) concentration) is not pertinent "X" for claim 11 (that is "new and inventive process of effect of use of medicaments (as PIP(2) against clinical death and coma)"). Even formally, it is quite different technical features (it is directly not "X"). Nobody never used "PIP(2)" against clinical death and coma. This is already it.

(Local Supplement: But reality is even opposite! It only confirms my much more Universal scientific knowledge about the Heart N^o1 process of any cell functioning: "PKC" vesicle vectorial cyclic transport with help of metabolism justly of PIP(2) and GTP derivatives, wherein the exhausting of stock of such molecules during internal phase conduct to irreversible impossibility to re-start new functioning and cell death. [As I established, it is only beginning (although being real cause) of apoptosis, that is judged as some self destruction already at level of lysa. One can compare it if to judge the cause of human death ("apoptosis") as destruction of body by bacteria without real knowledge: Infarct (that only "established" as above)]. So even could: not to cite "apoptosis" at all but I did it only for correct Universalization and general correctness and convergence (real convergence of ALL established) of Science of next century with known phenomena. And cited (by Search) work (Majilano et al) only confirms AGAIN that such GENERAL UNIVERSAL STRUCTURED CONCRETE irreversible stopping of "PKC" vesicle transport is correct being ONLY real UNKNOWN CAUSE and beginning of well known phenomenon "apoptosis" of cell destruction already at level of lysa. So this "fragment", confirming only small part of Grand scientific bases cannot be even "Y", but oppositely! Thank you, but it looks again like by Axe (covered by EPO governmental intentional authority) against Crystal of Science of Century).

b). Claim 3. In §3, complete nonsense of numerous "Xs" (that could be terribly much more: tens and tens, that had, already at International phase, to intimidate firms, scientists and inventors by such Intergovernmental authority) was clearly proven, as outstanding.

c). Claim 1. "X" of work "Dudlich et al" is also outstanding nonsense: "their" small protein for immunoglobulin G(Du-ZT according to name that I gave to it) is only one from thousands and thousands of such proteins (for each existing protein synthesized in ER->Golgi!!!) and serves in my invention as example. Thank you in forward to eliminate such direct nonsense from the International Search (only in International Search: thank you for letter), (IgG small protein, discovered by Dudlich is Du-ZT, all others are Du-ZT-like = "Du-ZT").

§5. Obvious slip in claim 9. This claim had to be valid against cancer too! That was well expressively written in Specification (p.48-3-6) and even in Abstract. It was purest obvious error too. I corrected obvious slip at International phase without any EPO answer. Only to simplify (that with such usurped "error", EPO will not have the pretext to avoid answer because of my long letter), I did not present such (less vital but very important: sure means against cancer) corrected claim again at entering at EPO National phase. Because EPO did not answer at International phase and I wanted to have answer even for the most essential (although even here, at drastic conciseness, I did not have). In evident case (anyway "affair" is too clear and intentionally penally against law, if EPO must make finally the UNMADE Search of this Claim 9, it must be done in last version without SLIP (against cancer too)).

§6. EVIDENT SENSE OF "TECHNICAL FEATURES" IN ALL PATENT LAWS. It really appears that Examiners (in making some silence) mean the "Industrial" sense under "technical features", "technical terms", and "technical problem". Wherein Legislation even underlines that "at least in this context (Y2: ALL Patent Law) the terms "technical" and "Industrial" were not synonyms" ("Case Law", p.141: T 953/94). According to "PCT Guidelines" (§5.04): "The claims must be drafted in terms of the "technical features", of the invention. This means that claims should not contain any statements relating, for example, to commercial advantages or other non-technical matters". (But is is perfectly not my case AT ALL). According to Rule 6.3(b)(i) (PCT): "technical features" of the invention are those "which are necessary for the definition of the claimed subject matter". The §10.58 (ibid) gives example of this "technical feature" as "ovon" ("fact of from French) encoding of dehydrogenases" with reference on Rule 13.2 PCT (as in ALL Legislation, evidently: "Rule 13.2 requires that technical feature shared between the inventions defines a contribution over the prior art. A same or corresponding technical feature shared among the claimed nucleic acid molecules resides in their common property (fact of) encoding dehydrogenases...". These are examples of "technical features" taken ONLY from Legislation (LAW): "particular amino acid sequences" ("Case Law", p.238, T 923/92); "intended use of product" ("Case Law", p.88); "maker for facilitating the reading and playing of music on a keyboard instrument" (T 603/89); "step of observing the effect of the candidate compounds on ligand binding" (§10.58 "PCT Guidelines"); link between DNA coding protein X with protein X (ibid §10.58); "insecticidal activity" (ibid §10.36; 10.54); "substance X" (ibid §10.21); "the paint containing substance X" (ibid §10.23); part of nucleotide (§10.53, 10.54). Why EPO did not write me about very visible to them slip (to correct) when EPO changed Abstract.

III. EPO KNEW ABOUT RECENT SOLUTION OF AIDS (DEFINITELY CONFIRMING THIS INVENTION: 9 MILLIONS VICTIMS SINCE 2002) BUT WANTED TO PASS AT ONCE TO "EXAMINATION" MAKING UNLEGAL PROCEDURE

Recently I discovered that, well done experimental work (J.Gen.Virol.85, 3735, 2004) confirmed directly undoubtly the proven mechanism of AIDS of this invention (= future Nobel Prize). After my letters-Faxes (always with electronic text by e-mails: epoline@epo.org and lae.ephelpdesk@epo.org). It means that EPO knew that since time of filing and surely intentional discredit by EPO Search (since 2002), there were 9 millions of innocent deaths. But EPO continued such discredit justly after these letters.

And justly in strange manner, like perfectly Organized crime to hide the traces, exceptionally, these letters did not appear at EPO Register (www.epo.org). And there is correlation with this: EPO prudently wrote (23/08/05) only about my (these) e-mails without confirmation of ALWAYS PARALLEL copies of signed Faxes (with often mentioned numbers of Fax receipts in e-mails). The Faxes were sent (07/07/05; N°FA1-03-41751, always from "Cyber Cube"; its e-mail at 30/08/05; (15/07/05; N°FA1-03-42504; its e-mail at 13/07/05; (21/07/05; N°FA1-03-43006; its e-mail at 21/07/05) (Fax of 11/08/05, its e-mail at 12/08/05). Fortunately, two last Faxes appeared at Register, but they suddenly disappeared (III). But I have the copy of Register of last very important letter (with EPO numbers: "Empf.zelt: 11/08/2005 10:40 Empf.nr.:850 P.001") that I am sending (8 pages).

Please, to confirm receiving of each of these FAXES. It looks like Organization wanted to destroy traces

of knowing of detailed proofs of definitive confirmation against AIDS (and also my insistent reminders to answer for SURE arguments against EPO Search) justly before intentionally penal "Examination" with sure criminal procedure and with sure responsibility before victims. (The Fax of 11/08/05 disappeared from Register justly after my sending of the copy of the same detailed letter to Prof.Kazatchkine to Collegium of European Judges wherein I sent by error another (nondetailed) attachment but Judges could see detailed signed letter at cited Register. It looks like perfect criminal Coordination). Thank you to insert the PRESENT letter (October's one) to Register wherein Judges (from ALL Europe) could read all signed "mysteries". 8000 victims per day!

IV. RESUME OF QUESTIONS AND DEMANDED CONFIRMATIONS TO ANSWER CONCRETELY AND POINT AFTER POINT. PLEASE, PROCEDURE WITHOUT SUCH ANSWERS WAS INTENTIONALLY UNLEGAL

SIIA. 1). Please, to confirm that qualified EPO intentionally wrote illegality (like in all my other Applications) in International Search Report: "claims 1, 2, 6 and 10 have not been searched as they relate to non patentable subject-matter under Rule 39.1(f) PCT" (scientific theories), wherein the Rule 39.1(f) means oppositely: "When viewing as a whole, if theories... produce a practical application... Search is required, since the result is not purely abstract or intellectual" ("PCT Guidelines" with reference to Rule 39.1(f)). Why did you do it?

2). To confirm that "common scientific theory (in this Application) does not support ALL practical claims at all" would be deception because: a). It would be exceptional case for pure scientific theory that do not substantiate AT ALL (no remedies) practical claims, which even is not mentioned in given examples of PCT and EPO "Guidelines" b). Such exceptional case of alien scientific theories for separated practical applications was not neither proven nor EVEN mentioned in International Search Report. c). In such case, without doubt, EPO had to ask to take off unrelated (wrong, misleading!) features (and even mention) of independent "scientific" claims "in nontheoretical practical claims, that was not the case AT ALL d). In such case of numerous independent practical claims DE FACTO, manifestation of absence of Unity of Invention had to be SURELY claimed in International Search that was not the case AT ALL.

3). Concretely as example, why scientific claim 1: "modality is obligatory for contaminated macrophage entering into brain to cause the encephalitis" does not substantiate claim 4: The use of "substances... for manufacture of medicaments against encephalitis that stops macrophage modality (inhibitors)" because of Claim 1: "modality is obligatory for contaminated macrophage entering into brain to cause the encephalitis". Is it not, even formally, self-evident? (Of course, as in my cases, claim 4 could be in equal recommended Form (PCT and EPO "Guidelines" §5.21 and CIV-4.2) (moreover with special ingenious assuring reference to Art. 52(4) in claim: ordering to search the process!!!), which EPO however did not do directly intentionally: "Substance X" for use as medicament for curing disease "Y".

4). Why EPO could make search, with nonsense, of claim 3 (although with correct, the same, as all other therapeutic claims forms; see §3 above) without scientific theory at all, it is only DECLARATION????

5). Claim 10 is the scientific theory (process "upon living things" ("PCT Guidelines" §5.12) of biosynthesis of ANY protein. j) which is at the same time practical and is the best example for §14.05 ("ibid"): "In most cases industrial applicability will be self-evident and no more explicit description on this point will be required" (as even Legislation of "Board of Appeals" did with similar but even less trivial cases of general purification of proteins (T 015099-EP313343; T 091694; 043098; 031163). So why did such too obvious primitive DESTRUCTION that will become classical example of such) moreover of the extraordinary (that not biosynthesis based on very profound correct living processes) in place? Moreover, only this (as "a whole": for instance: T 002688) a priori annuls fantastical deception 1 about nonsubstantiated practical claims by scientific theory AT ALL (here it is perfectly the same and AT ALL).

§1b. 6). Why EPO did not search the new and inventive therapeutic processes (that is OBLIGATORY according to Law: Footnote of Art.52(4) EPC, that was especially taken over in claim 10 DO IT!!!), but instead pretended to search all substances themselves but not the effect of all SUCH substances on therapeutic process (curing)??? (As in claim 4: not all substances which inhibit movement of macrophages (moreover such substances are unpredictable and uncorrectable) but effect of inhibitors of movement of macrophages in curing of encephalitis (that was proven by profound precise scientific

theory: IT IS TOO SIMPLE AND CLEAR).

7). Does EPO agree that strange reference to medicaments as "result to be achieved" (claims 4, 5, 8, 11, 12) has no sense ALREADY according to above §6, because I do not need to patent (to search) all substances which will inhibit macrophage movement but I need to patent only effect of ALL such substances (even yet unknown substances), which ALL inhibit (inhibitors) macrophage movement on process of curing (therapy) of encephalitis???

8). Why "always given examples" are not examples (according to EPO) for Claims 4, 5, 7(8), 9 and 12 at obligatory Searching of new and inventive therapeutic PROCESS and best "general therapeutic purpose" "covering the whole field of therapy" (and even well characterized examples even in claim 7(8) itself)? Please, to explain with EACH Claim as in §1b (1)-(5)??

9). In particular Claim 5, one can only unlegally "guess" what did EPO mean that "non of such kits" was described (see §1b(5) of this letter: because: a). The too obvious under-meaning that kit "only" comprises antiviral antibodies ("only" comprises as in: T 000389, 008394, 077592, 031059, 012000) (wherein such much more important antibodies only serve for productive contaminations in difference with gradients although simple too) or b). That there is no number of nonobligatory reference for Manual with numerous classical techniques for determination of viruses (since Pasteur) as cited already in Application: "Fields Virology" (with several thousands of pages and Refs); or c) EPO does not like used best "general diagnosis purpose" "covering the whole field of diagnosis" ("Case Law" p.88, T 4382)???

10). Why did EPO demonstratively ignore, in silence, the corrected pages 82 and 87 with obvious surely proven errors (slips) (see §1c), which are moreover ample coordinates of already described and numbered references which are always could or even should be inserted (PCT and EPO "Guidelines" § 20.10, §CIV-5.3 and §4.26 and CIV-4.18)???

SII-1. 11). Why EPO did not search Claim 7 with new direct product (Universal small regulatory proteins) of precise scientific theory as part of proven new great law of functioning of proteins? Wherein these small proteins ("Du-ZT") are: (1) characterized by a number of their very particular vital functions even in claim; (2) easily obtainable; (3) exemplified by really obtainable small proteins of IgG and MHC I alpha chain. Wherein all other "Du-ZT" can be analogically purified due to their proven Universal properties.

12). Why EPO does not search Claim 8 according to order of law as new and inventive therapeutic process against a number of important diseases utilizing the prescribed form of claim of PCT and EPO "Guidelines" (§5.21, CIV-4.2) (moreover, incessantly underlining again to search justly the above process, stipulated in included even in claim Reference on Art.52(4) EPC with Footnotes) and used de facto for search by EPO in claims 3 and 11, being as "general therapeutic purpose", "covering whole field of therapy" ("Case Law", p.88, T 4382)???

SII-2a. 13). Why EPO does not search Claim 5 according to order of law as new and inventive diagnostic process of body fluids for determination of real viruses (thus utilizing the prescribed (by Legislation) Form of Claim (moreover underlining to search the process with presence of Ref. to Art.52(4) EPC, Footnotes) and used for search by EPO in claims 3 and 11 wherein New utilization of antiviral antibodies (much more principal technical feature than simple gradient) is compared to classical determinations (as in numerous Legislation T 000389; 008394; 077592; 031059; 012000), being as general diagnostic (therapeutic purpose, covering whole field of diagnosis (therapy)) ("Case Law" p.88, T 4382)???

SII-2b. 14). Why EPO does not search Claim 9 according to order of law as new and inventive therapeutic process against AIDS, autoimmune diseases, cancer utilizing the prescribed Form of claim of PCT and EPO "Guidelines" (§5.21, CIV-4.2) (moreover, incessantly underlining again to search justly the above process, stipulated in included even in claim Reference on Art.52(4) EPC with Footnotes) and used de facto for search by EPO in claims 3 and 11, being as "general therapeutic purpose", "covering whole field of therapy" ("Case Law" p.88, T 4382), wherein charged offine molecules (as antibodies) are exemplified with offine molecules coupled with one of large number of existing charged polymers that are coupled with carbonyl and amino group activations, with N-acyl activated derivatives, with famous coupling reagents (wherein other charged offine molecules can be applied "without undue difficulty"???)

§1b-2c. 15). Why EPO does not search this Claim 11 on new inventive therapeutic process according to order of law against clinical death and coma (definitive loss of consciousness) (but not against "apoptosis" as such) with effect of substances (PIP(2) and its derivatives or GTP-gammaS molecules and I took numerous claim than I could: could to all substances that have below property) that stop breivable

Inhibition of circular transporting neuron and heart ("PKC") vesicles, although with accepted by EPO Form of claim [taken from Legislation (ibid §5.21, CIV.4.2) with Included Reference to Art.52(4) EPC with Footnotes to UNDERLINE search of PROCESS] being as "general therapeutic purpose", "covering whole field of therapy" ("Case Law" p.86, T 4382)??? (P.S. Of course, EPO did not ask and did not read very important Ref. 111: it means very bad PROVEN reading a priori!).

§II-2d. 16). Why EPO does not search Claim 12 according to order of law as new and inventive therapeutic process against insomnia using the prescribed Form of claims of PCT and EPO "Guidelines" (§5.21, CIV.4.2) [moreover, ingeniously underlining again to search justly the above process, stipulated in included even in claim Reference to Art.52(4) EPC with Footnotes] and used de facto for Search by EPO In included even in claim Reference to Art.52(4) EPC with Footnotes] and used de facto for Search by EPO In claims 3 and 11, being as "general therapeutic process", "covering whole field of therapy" ("Case Law" p.86, T 4382), wherein diluted cyanate exemplified partial inhibition of functioning working cycle of closed vesicular synaptic transports of network of neurons (of superior brain) determining "keeping awake" (and all other inhibitors could be applied "without undue difficulty")???

§II-2e. 17). Why EPO does not search Claim 4, according to order of law as new and inventive therapeutic process against encephalitis using the prescribed Form of claims of PCT and EPO "Guidelines" (§5.21, CIV.4.2) [moreover, ingeniously underlining again to search justly the above process, stipulated in included even in claim Reference to Art.52(4) EPC with Footnotes] and used de facto for Search by EPO in claims 3 and 11, being as "general therapeutic process", "covering whole field of therapy" ("Case Law" p.86, T 4382), wherein antireceptor antibodies (specific and routinely made according to even cited in Application Manuals), exemplified inhibition of macrophage movement and any other inhibitor of macrophage movement (which existed: see §II-2e) could be SIMPLY applied (ONLY APPLIED!) too??

§II-3. 18). To confirm that this claim 3 must be re-searched with "scientific theory" as a whole [real technical problem of claims 1 (8, 10, 14) and 3] (".....increase of the virus contaminations is minimal (zero) because the corresponding antiviral antibodies could increase the cell contaminations with Fc receptor help wherein the heterogeneity of these antibodies is, generally, obligatory for the virus entry according to claim 1 (8, 10, 14) (scientific theory)". And to confirm that this practical claim is defined by reference to "result to be achieved" wherein justly this "invention... can only be defined in such terms" ("EPO Guidelines" CII-4.7), [that could be resolved with help of famous "routine trial and error" (ibid CIV-2.2; T 435/91 §6.2).

§II-4. 19). To confirm that at Search with Revolutionary scientific theory ("as a whole") of Claims 11 and 3 there will be no "X" and "Y". And to confirm that work of Dudich et al (Claim 7) concerns only one Universal small protein (Du-2T) that justly, sole, does not present in claiming for thousands and thousands of all other such Universal proteins "Du-2T LIKE".

§II-5. 20). To confirm that EPO accepts obvious error (slip) (concerning powerful means against cancer) in claim 9 (in spite of my correction made yet at International phase at EPO complete silence).

§II-6. 21). To confirm that "technical features" of invention are those "which are necessary for the definition of the claimed subject matter" [Rule 6.3(b)(ii) (PCT)] and this term (of these two words) has nothing with sense "industrial" in Patent Laws ("Case Law", p.141). To confirm that below examples of "technical features" from Legislation are correct: "fact of encoding dehydrogenases", "particular amino acid sequence", "intended use of product", "maker for facilitating the reading and playing on a keyboard instrument", "step of observing the effect of the candidate compounds on ligand binding", "link between DNA coding protein X with protein X", "insecticidal activity", "substance X", "the paint containing substance X", "part of nucleotide". So to confirm that "technical features" of invention in claims signifies: "that claims should not contain any statements relating, for example, to commercial advantages or other non-technical matters" ("PCT Guidelines" §5.04). I do not have this AT ALL. What is the special problem?

§II. 22). To confirm, please, receiving of SIGNED Faxes of 07/07/5; 15/07/05 and 12/08/05. Why, exceptionally, they are not at EPO Register?? Why Faxes of 21/07/05 and 12/08/05 even disappeared from EPO Register??? Justly Faxes with clearly definitively experimentally confirmed solution of AIDS by good work of Others (2004), confirming Intentional Crime against Humanity (8000 deaths/ day), is it Criminal ORGANIZATION?

Statement about corrections in pages 82, 87, 97.

I, Zagvansky Yuly, sole inventor of Application EP 02718172.6 (PCT/EP0202302), make the following corrections of obvious errors (slips) (to see detailed §Ic and §5 of Main text of letter): p.82-(35-37): Missed coordinates of cited references of Part VI (N°5-10), p.87- (15-21): Missed coordinates of cited references of Chapters XI and Annex IIIA, p.97 (Claim 9), I added: "or against cancer cells". Supplement: photocopies of the same Refs: from my Appl. PCT/FR97/01706 and PCT/FR98/02334 retired (but present in EPO as ISA).

1. "Immunochimistry-Labman". Ed. R. M. A. Thompson. R. Bloch. Publishers: Oxford, 1994.
2. R. M. A. Thompson. R. Bloch. "Anticorps: un manuel de laboratoire". Ed. R. M. A. Thompson. R. Bloch. Publishers: Oxford, 1994.
3. Zagvansky Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
4. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
5. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
6. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
7. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
8. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
9. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
10. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
11. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
12. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
13. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
14. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
15. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
16. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
17. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
18. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
19. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
20. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
21. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
22. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
23. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
24. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
25. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
26. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
27. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
28. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
29. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
30. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
31. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
32. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
33. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
34. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
35. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
36. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
37. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
38. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
39. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
40. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
41. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
42. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
43. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
44. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
45. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
46. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
47. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
48. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
49. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
50. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
51. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
52. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
53. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
54. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
55. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
56. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
57. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
58. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
59. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
60. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
61. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
62. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
63. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
64. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
65. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
66. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
67. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
68. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
69. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
70. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
71. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
72. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
73. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
74. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
75. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
76. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
77. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
78. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
79. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
80. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
81. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
82. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
83. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
84. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
85. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
86. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
87. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
88. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
89. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
90. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
91. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
92. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
93. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
94. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
95. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
96. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
97. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
98. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
99. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
100. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
101. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
102. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
103. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
104. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
105. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
106. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
107. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
108. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
109. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
110. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
111. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
112. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
113. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
114. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
115. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
116. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
117. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
118. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
119. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
120. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
121. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
122. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
123. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
124. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
125. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
126. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
127. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
128. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
129. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
130. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
131. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
132. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
133. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
134. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
135. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
136. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
137. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
138. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
139. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
140. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
141. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
142. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
143. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
144. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
145. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
146. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
147. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
148. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
149. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
150. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
151. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
152. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
153. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
154. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
155. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
156. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
157. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
158. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
159. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
160. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
161. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
162. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
163. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
164. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
165. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
166. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
167. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
168. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
169. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
170. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
171. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
172. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
173. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
174. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
175. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
176. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
177. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
178. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
179. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
180. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
181. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
182. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
183. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
184. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
185. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
186. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
187. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
188. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
189. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
190. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
191. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
192. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
193. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
194. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
195. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
196. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
197. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
198. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
199. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
200. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
201. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
202. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
203. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
204. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
205. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
206. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
207. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
208. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
209. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
210. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
211. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
212. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
213. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
214. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
215. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
216. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
217. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
218. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
219. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
220. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
221. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
222. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
223. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
224. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
225. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
226. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
227. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
228. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
229. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
230. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
231. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
232. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
233. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
234. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
235. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
236. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
237. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
238. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
239. Thompson Y. "Publication N°068/06837, caractere of PCT N°20.1988".
2

HEURE: 21/04/2006 10:35

DATE, HEURE
NUMERO/NOM FAX
DUREE
PAGE(S)
RESULT
MODE

21/04 10 3
00157127 8
00:01:59
01
JK
STANDARD
ECM



Cyber Cube

5, rue Mignon
75006 Paris
01.53.10.30.50
01.40.46.80.46
www.cybercube.fr
RCS Paris B 413 095 191 (97B10429)

Facture N°: FA1-06-03416

Date: 21/04/2006

Comptoir

Code	Designation	Quantite	Prix	Sous Total
3002	Feuilles de fax envoyée	1	1,00 €	1,00 €
3003	Unités téléphoniques	6	0,15 €	0,90 €

Total HT: 1,59 €

TVA: 0,31 €

Total TTC: 1,90 €


Règlement: ESP

[Signature]
21/04/06

HEURE: 28/11/2005 19:51

DATE, HEURE
NUMERO/NOM FAX
DUREE
PAGE(S)
RESULT
MODE

28/11 19:51
0015712738300
00:00:43
01
OK
STANDARD
ECM



Cyber Cube

5, rue Mignon
75006 Paris
01.53.10.30.50
01.40.46.80.46
www.cybercube.fr
RCS Paris B 413 095 191 (97B10429)

Facture N°: FA1-03-55953

Date: 28/11/2005

Comptoir

Code	Designation	Quantite	Prix	Sous Total
3002	Feuilles de fax envoyée	1	1,00 €	1,00 €
3003	Unités téléphoniques	2	0,15 €	0,30 €

Total HT: 1,09 €

TVA: 0,21 €

Total TTC: 1,30 €

Règlement: ESP

Fax: ~~1-773-872-9306~~ Y. Zagyansky : 1-571-273-8300

United States Patent and Trademark Office Dr. Y. Zagyansky, Entraide, 22 rue Ste Marthe
Appl. 10/505,353 (PCT/EP02/02302) Conf. 2545 75010 Paris, Paris, 28th November 2005

Dear Sir, I did not receive the answer even for important question during procedure, even of Covering letter (§5) (even after my insistent reminders). "III§5. In view of very special "strange" course of my Application, I must ask here very important question about "Notice of abandonment". In US law, concerning "Certificat of mailing or transmission" (37 CFR §1.8, §512 MPEP) there is no mention about, even declaration, FOR nonreceiving of USPTO LETTERS (ONLY of USPTO letters!), but only text about Ceratificat of mailing or transmission of Applicant letter. Does it mean that USPTO finally, send the registered letter wherein USPTO is sure about their receiving by Applicant and such Declaration (for nonreceiving of USPTO letter) is not needed consequently? Thank you very much for forward explanation of this TOO important information. The heavy common truth is coming from Governmental Office?..".

2. In coinciding, I confirm again that there is no any news since your last letter of June 2005 ("Notice of Publication"). Should I wait obligatory registered letter (only after such knowledge from Internet?) in the case of permanent logical disappearances of letters in almost each my Application? VERY unfortunately, it could be looked as specific special "USPTO.GOV"'s CAMPF.

3. According to §1.103 (a) MPEP ("Suspension of action by the Office"). (a) SUSPENSION FOR CAUSE. ("for good and sufficient cause"), ANYWAY, I ask to suspend action for 6 months. The causes are: 1). ISA (EPO) made very Intentional PENAL SURE Crimes with falsifications and I wait clear confirmation of it and REMAKING OF INTERNATIONAL SEARCH WITH INTERNATIONAL PHASE (WIPO was in current of SURE falsification). (see complete VERY detailed copy of my letter to EPO of 10/22/2005 by e-mails as Supplement to this signed letter: James.Groody@uspto.gov, Derek.Putonen@uspto.gov, Ahmed.Hakeel@uspto.gov). This letter was so convincing that it disappeared LATER(CENSURED!) from EPO Register (www.epo.org: "epoline"-->"Register"). Thank you in forward for such very objective (necessary for USPTO too) SUSPENSION.

4. Without any reason and explanation, USPTO did not include MY correctons (surely proven obvious errors) in publication. WHY? Sincerely yours Dr. Y. Zagyansky

Y. Zagyansky

EPO Register Stamp:

EPO - Munich
29
27. Okt. 2005

Letter, letter
disappeared. Inter-
governmental censure
of too convincing
crime against
humanity?

Application N°EP 02 718172.6- 1521 (PCT/EP02/02302): "END OF AIDS.."
European Patent Office Dr. Y. Zagyansky, Entraide, 22 rue Sainte Marthe 75010 Paris France
[e-mail Copies to President of EPO Prof. Alain Pompidou ("Mister AIDS") (apompidou@epo.org), Vice-
Presidents: Mrs. T. Hammer, P. Kyriakides, P. Messerli, C. Edfjäll, M. Desantes; President and Vice-President
of EPO Administrative Council Roland.Grossenbacher@ipl.ch, Allison.Brimelow@patent.gov.uk,
council_secretary@epo.org, with all its (Adm. Council) National Members as: AT@epo.org.....; Principal (of
course) Director of International Affairs and Patent Law Wim Van Der Eijk: wvdijk@epo.org, Head of
Legal and International Affairs Felix.Addor@ipl.ch, International_legal_affairs@epo.org, Directors
European and International Affairs Johan Amand and A. Purucker-Kandell: jamand@epo.org,
apurucker@epo.org, Patent Academy academy@epo.org and also to Director of World International
Patent Organization K. Idris (wipo.mall@wipo.int) and to General Collegium of European Judges for
Concerning Information: Imminent Accusation In Intentional Crime against Humanity and Intentional
Bribe for Millions by Powerful Ruling BIG ORGANIZATION In EPO]. Paris, 22th October 2005.

INTRODUCTORY GENERAL PART.


Sir, 1. PROTEST. This letter is PROTEST against penally destructed International Search ("Search") without any answer for EVIDENT arguments that EPO cannot answer simply ignoring them as EPO can do systematically in silence being above law, like due to special Power of Big Organization. After such primitive intentional ignoring, the illegal jumping, at once, to Examination represents the completely illegal procedure with its product: so called "Examination", existence of which is under protest too.

2. CONTENT. This letter (as the signed postal original that must be at EPO Register for all Judges too) contains 24 pages (all pages are signed): (1) "RESUME". (2) "Essential Questions of Résumé" (3) "PURPOSE", (4) "Main Text of Letter" with "Résumé of Questions and demanded confirmations". With its Supplements: a). Statement about below (§c) corrections with photocopies of coordinates of cited Refs from my retired PCT/FR97/01706 and PCT/FR98/02334 (100% proofs of obvious errors de facto). There is no relation between these slips and EPO's remarks. b). Copy (from EPO REGISTER with its traces) of my TOO IMPORTANT

Y. Zagyansky
with 22 APR 2006
VERSO

DATE, HEURE
NUMERO/NOM FAX
DUREE
PAGE(S)
RESULT
MODE

28/11 19:51
0015712738300
00:00:43
01
OK
STANDARD
ECM



Cyber Cube

5, rue Mignon
75006 Paris
01.53.10.30.50
01.40.46.80.46
www.cybercube.fr
RCS Paris B 413 095 191 (97B10429)

Facture N°: FA1-03-55953

Date: 28/11/2005

Comptoir

Code	Designation	Quantite	Prix	Sous Total
3002	Feuilles de fax envoyée	1	1,00 €	1,00 €
3003	Unités téléphoniques	2	0,15 €	0,30 €

Total HT: 1,09 €

TVA: 0,21 €

Total TTC: 1,30 €

Règlement: ESP